

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-48 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18, 23-24, 34, 41, 45-46 and 48 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7, 9-21, 23-25, and 31-48 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-21, 23-25, and 31-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chin *et al.* (U.S. 6,456,306). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Chin *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a system and method for managing and interfacing to a plurality of servers cooperating as an entity. To this end independent claim 1 recites: ***a user interface to display and manage a collection of independent servers operating as if a single entity, comprising; a representation of a collection of the independent servers as a single entity; an individual representation of each independent server associated with the entity; a new cluster wizard that creates a new server and sets up load-balancing for each independent server, wherein each server is given a suitable amount of work; an add cluster member wizard that adds additional servers to the collection of servers; and a new deployment wizard that deploys contents across collection of independent servers.*** Chin *et al.* is silent regarding such novel aspects of the claimed invention.

Instead, Chin *et al.* provides a method and apparatus for concurrently displaying from a single window on a network management station the health status of all network devices and objects of a computer network. The method and apparatus provides a network manager with the

ability to determine the current state of network devices and objects within an enterprise network and to add new network devices and objects within the single network.

The reference (Chin *et al.*) provides for a user interface to display and manage a plurality of entities as a single entity and a representation of a collection of members as a single entity and an individual representation of each member associated with the entity, however plurality of entities displayed and managed as a single entity by Chin *et al.* are within *one enterprise network or server only* and the reference displays and manages only *health status of devices* (device is functioning properly or not) *within the network or server* without teaching or suggesting displaying and managing *a collection of independent servers* operating as a single entity. The reference also provides to add new network devices and objects in the network, however they are being added *within single network or server* without teaching or suggesting *creating a new server and setting up load-balancing for each independent server, wherein each server is given a suitable amount of work; adding additional servers to the collection of servers; and deploying contents across collection of independent servers*. Hence Chin *et al.* is silent with respect to *a user interface to display and manage a collection of independent servers operating as if a single entity, comprising: a representation of a collection of the independent servers as a single entity; an individual representation of each independent server associated with the entity; a new cluster wizard that creates a new server and sets up load-balancing for each independent server, wherein each server is given a suitable amount of work; an add cluster member wizard that adds additional servers to the collection of servers; and a new deployment wizard that deploys contents across collection of independent servers*.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Chin *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the subject claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claims 1 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 6 and 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin *et al.* in view of Richardson (U.S. 6,271,845). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Chin *et al.* and Richardson either combined or separately do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. In particular,

Richardson does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Chin *et al.* with respect to amended independent claim 1 (which claims 6 and 8 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 6 and 8 is not obvious over the combination of Chin *et al.* and Richardson.

**III. Rejection of Claims 22 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin *et al.* in view of Manghirmalani *et al.* (U.S. 5,819,028). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Chin *et al.* and Manghirmalani *et al.* either combined or separately do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Manghirmalani *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Chin *et al.* with respect to amended independent claim 1(which claims 22 and 26 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 22 and 26 is not obvious over the combination of Chin *et al.* and Manghirmalani *et al.*

**IV. Rejection of Claims 27-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin *et al.* in view of Bradley *et al.* (U.S. 6,584,507). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Chin *et al.* and Bradley *et al.* either combined or separately do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Bradley *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Chin *et al.* with respect to amended independent claim 1(which claims 27-30 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 27-30 is not obvious over the combination of Chin *et al.* and Bradley *et al.*

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP116US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731